

Key for Record

10

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 3711

3/31/03

3.2.055

PATENT
Y00-044

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: MICHAEL D. BULLOCK ET AL : Date: March 26, 2003
Serial No.: 09/735,002 :
Filed: December 12, 2000 : Group Art Unit: 3711
For: PRACTICE PUTTER AND HEAD :
Examiner: Thanh P. Duong

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D. C. 20231

Sir:

In further response to the Office Action mailed January 14, 2003, and specifically in response to the Advisory Action mailed March 19, 2003, please consider the following remarks regarding the allowability of the above-identified patent application. Please note that the Advisory Action failed to indicate the required period for reply (neither check box a) or b) was checked).

REMARKS

Regarding the status of the present application, Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the present response does not require further searching on the part of the Examiner. It is also respectfully submitted that this response places this application in condition for allowance, or in any event, places it in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 3,489,415 issued to Smith in view of US Patent No. 5,135,228 issued to Hawkins, Sr. The Examiner has essentially repeated the rejection stated in the prior Office Action. Notwithstanding the Examiner's rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of the Smith and Hawkins, Sr. patents, taken singly or together.

The Examiner stated in the Advisory Action that the request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance because "Smith '415 in view of Hawkins, Sr. '228 suggests and/or teaches the claimed invention as stated in the final action. Applicant's argument is merely that there is no 102, i.e. no one reference anticipating the invention. That is not the rejection." It is respectfully submitted that Applicants argued the fact that the combined teachings of the Smith and Hawkins, Sr. patents do not disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed. The Examiner has apparently misread or misunderstood what was stated in the Response dated March 4, 2003.